

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 22, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-32 remain in the application. New claim 33 has been added in order to set forth an additional specific embodiment that the Applicants regard as their invention. Support for new claim 33 can be found throughout the specification as filed, at least at paragraphs [0019] and [0021]. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicants' below-listed Attorney would like to sincerely thank Examiner Shah for all the time and courtesies extended during the personal interview of August 16, 2007. During the interview, claims 1-32 were discussed in light of Kato, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054187). Applicants showed that Kato was deficient in that the reference did not teach redispersing or redissolving a **precipitate formed by the reactive inks**. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection upon filing the present response.

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Lavery, et al. (WO 00/37258). The Examiner states that Kato discloses an orifice plate comprising at least two orifices, where at least one orifice prints a first reactive ink and the other orifice prints a fixer or a second reactive ink. The Examiner asserts that the first reactive ink and the second reactive ink react to form a solid precipitate, where the solid precipitate is redispersible or redissolvable in at least one of the first reactive ink or the second reactive ink. The Examiner admits that Kato fails to teach that the fixer comprises a positively charged species, such as a polymer; the fixer is selected from poly(thyleneimine); the fixer comprises polyethyleneimine and poly(biguanidine) or salts thereof; and the ink includes at least two dyes. The Examiner further states that Lavery supplies the deficiencies of Kato.

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites, "wherein the **solid precipitate** is **redispersible or redissolvable** in at least one of the first reactive ink, or the fixer or

the second reactive ink.” (Emphasis added.) Applicants’ independent claims 9, 17, and 25 each include a similar recitation.

Kato discloses an ink jet recording head provided with plural arrays of discharge ports for discharging plural inks of at least three kinds in which a first ink and at least one of the other inks are mutually reactive. (Paragraph [0013].) As provided in paragraphs [0136] – [0137], Kato further discloses a black ink formulation (as one of the reactive inks) including a black coloring material having a high dispersibility. When the black ink is mixed with a reactive color ink, the two inks react and form a precipitate of the black coloring material.

Applicants submit that Kato fails to teach that the precipitate formed from the reaction of the two reactive inks is **redispersible** or **redissolvable** in the first reactive ink or the second reactive ink. Although Kato discloses that the black coloring material may be highly dispersible due to the introduction of a hydrophilic radical into the surface of carbon black (see paragraph [0137]), **nowhere** does Kato disclose that the precipitate is dispersible. In fact, Kato provides in paragraph [0137] that, upon formation of the precipitate, the black coloring material is **prevented from moving through** the print area of the non-reactive color ink adjacent to the print area of the black ink. Thus, if the precipitated black coloring material cannot move through the print area of the non-reactive color ink, then the precipitated black coloring material is **not dispersible** in the non-reactive color ink.

Further, since Kato **fails** to disclose that the precipitate is **dispersible** or **disolvable** in the non-reactive ink, one skilled in the art could conclude that the precipitate is also not **redispersible** or **redissolvable** in the non-reactive ink.

For the reasons provided above, Applicants submit that Kato fails to establish all elements of independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 25. Applicants further submit that Lavery fails to supply the deficiencies of Kato. More specifically, Lavery discloses an ink jet printing process including, in any order or simultaneously, applying an ink to a substrate and applying a composition to the substrate. (See Abstract of Lavery.)

Nowhere does Lavery disclose forming a **precipitate** from a reaction of the ink with the fixer, where the precipitate is **redispersible or redissolvable** in the ink.

As such, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 25, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Kato and Lavery, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

In summary, claims 1-32 remain in the application, and new claim 33 has been added herein. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicants' invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33368
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813
Dated: September 24, 2007
JCD/AMS